

Notes from Engineering Meeting--DRAFT
February 8, 2008
Notes prepared by: Judy Hughey

Yacoub Najjar introduced the task force members and College administrators. There appeared to be approximately 50 faculty present.

Yacoub presented an overview of the task force report. He included a history of the present task force and the former task forces and committees. Emphasis in the presentation was on the eight areas. Communications and critical thinking were discussed as integral components in all courses.

Questions and STRONG concerns were as follows:

1. It was felt that too many courses required out of the program. There was great concern that the new general education would have a negative impact on the College of Engineering.
2. Could “environmental stewardship” be included in the eight areas?
3. Will there be enough courses to cover the areas?
4. Could a student take a one-hour course and cover an area?
5. Will there be confusion on course content and tagging?
6. Who will “police” the tagging process?
7. There is great concern over the tagging issue. It was suggested the task force remove the “artificial” number of tags.
8. Why only 1 or 2 tags per course? It was suggested that courses be allowed to have at least two tags. The question was also raised about students being allowed to count two areas in one course.
9. There is great concern that students will have only breadth and no depth. Several felt that depth was more important than breadth.
10. Several felt that the present engineering assessment process was sufficient measurement.
11. There were many questions on the assessment process. Some faculty described a new assessment as impossible.
12. It was felt by many that the present UGE System was working. This was discussed at length. The question was raised regarding why an assessment process could not be developed using the present system. Many felt as if more explanation was needed regarding WHY the current system is not working.

13. There was concern that the task force members were not sufficiently aware of the assessment system currently required for engineering accreditation.
14. Many had grave concerns that more courses would have to be added to the engineering program. It was suggested that the task force review and tag all the syllabi. This would enable the faculty to know that the areas could be covered in their existing coursework.
15. Do the administration and/or task force have proof that KSU students lack breadth?
16. Who made the decisions to have the eight areas? Some feel they overlap.
17. Why are engineering and technology missing from the eight areas?
18. Could some of the areas be combined? For example, Global Community and Individuals Within Social Systems seem to overlap.
19. Why is the task force “rushing the system” or “pushing it down our throats?”
20. Are we trying to “back” into the assessment process?
21. Will the general education program and assessment be “bean counting?”
22. There was concern that the new general education program does not address SLO outcomes.
23. It was suggested that the task force look for holistic opportunities for students such as theatre and concerts.
24. What will happen with transfer students? Will transfer students have to retake general education courses (such as General Psychology) to earn general education credit?
25. There were questions regarding the iSIS system ability to implement the new tagging system.

Task force responses

The task force representatives explained the report was in draft form and revisions were expected. Faculty members were encouraged to complete their feedback forms.

Task force members explained the changes in direction from the current system to the proposed system. Changes discussed included an emphasis from pedagogy to content.

We tried to emphasize the commitment of the task force NOT to increase credit hours in any program.